THE REMONSTRANCE
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, APRIL, 1914

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women

Eighty-six Branch Committees; 22,887 members in 387 cities, towns, and villages*

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, President.
MISS ANNA L. DAWES,
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,
MISS AGNES IRWIN,
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL,
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL,
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,
Vice-Presidents
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer pro tem., Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS E. C. POST, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y.
Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

* *Net present membership of women over 21 years of age: eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State*

BY NO MEANS "SURE TO COME"

THAT is a hasty and unreflecting judgment which declares that woman suffrage is "sure to come" and that it is therefore useless to contend against it.

Woman suffrage is not "sure to come." It can be restricted within its present limits by the energetic and concerted action of the men and women who are opposed to it. It is now on its way to defeat at the polls in several of the most important states in the Union.

From the boastfulness of the suffragists, it might be supposed that the suffrage movement was sweeping everything before it. But this is not true. The suffrage movement *has not gained a foot of territory through the vote of the male electorate, east of the Mississippi River. Not one of the New England states, not one of the Middle states, not one of the Southern states, not one of the Middle Western states has given full suffrage to women.*

Nor is this all. Every state east of the Mississippi in which the proposal to give the ballot to women has been submitted to the voters *has defeated it by an overwhelming majority.*

What, then, is the present situation? Simply, that in nine states west of the Mississippi women have the full vote. The combined population of these nine states is less than the combined population of New York city, Chicago and Philadelphia. The combined population of seven of them is less than the population of New York city alone. Are these nine mostly sparsely-settled states—only three of which have a population of as many as a million each—likely to force their policy upon the other thirty-nine?

And what is the immediate prospect? No one will deny that the East, not to mention the South, is more conservative than the West. Suppose that New York votes upon this question next year. *Is it any more likely to be carried for suffrage than Ohio, which defeated it by a majority of 87,455?* Suppose that the proposed suffrage amendment is submitted to the voters of New Jersey next year. *Are they any more likely to adopt it than the voters of Wisconsin, who rejected it by a majority of 91,479?* Suppose that the question goes to the voters of Pennsylvania next year. *Is it probable that they will act upon it any more favorably than those of Michigan, who gave a majority of 96,144 against it?*

Against the rash and ill-considered declaration that woman suffrage is "sure to come," THE REMONSTRANCE sets this simple statement of facts and probabilities. And it bases upon them the prediction that the year 1915 is destined to witness the heaviest defeats which the suffrage movement has yet experienced.

WHAT DID THE VOTERS MEAN?

THE REMONSTRANCE prints below, from the official returns to the Secretary of State, the vote by counties, November 4, 1913, upon the proposed amendment to the Constitution of Massachusetts to make women eligible to appointment as notaries public.

	Yes	No
Barnstable	1,191	1,438
Berkshire	4,230	4,892
Bristol	9,998	16,205
Dukes	200	261
Essex	22,547	24,569
Franklin	2,066	2,163
Hampden	10,253	11,338
Hampshire	2,584	3,656
Middlesex	35,973	38,525
Nantucket	145	206
Norfolk	9,720	10,494
Plymouth	7,555	7,916
Suffolk	32,388	37,534
Worcester	15,841	22,146
	154,691	181,343

The majority against the proposed amendment was 26,652. And this was not on a light vote. Comparison of these figures with the total vote of all parties for Governor shows that more than three-fourths of the voters who voted for Governor voted Yes or No upon this amendment. It is rare that any proposed amendment draws out so large a proportion of the vote. At the very same election, the vote on the amendment authorizing the referendum,—an amendment which was adopted by a large majority, was 51,578 less than

the vote recorded on the notaries public amendment. Moreover, the hostile majorities were not confined to the cities or large towns. It will be noticed that every county in the state, not even excepting little Dukes and Nantucket, voted against the amendment.

These are the facts. Now what do they mean? The proposal voted on was a harmless one, which had aroused no opposition in or out of the Legislature; and had scarcely been discussed. Almost anyone would have predicted that it would draw out only a light vote, but that it would be adopted by an overwhelming majority of those who voted. Precisely the opposite happened. The vote was exceptionally heavy and the amendment was defeated.

Is there any other possible explanation of this vote except that it was practically an expression against woman suffrage? Harmless and unimportant as the proposition in itself was, the average man, when he found it on his ballot, welcomed it as a quasi referendum on the suffrage question. It gave him an opportunity to say, after a fashion, what he thought of the silly "hikes," of feminine soap-box oratory at street corners, of the heckling of candidates, and of the interruption of public meetings. It was not a first-class opportunity, but it was better than nothing and he used it.

Nineteen years ago, on the direct question of the expediency of giving the municipal ballot to women, the men of the State voted in the negative by a majority of more than 100,000,—the heaviest adverse majority ever recorded, up to that time, on any question submitted to the people in this State. The vote on the notaries-public amendment gave the first opportunity since 1895 for a similar expression. It faintly foreshadows what may be looked for if the direct question of full woman suffrage is ever submitted to Massachusetts voters.

CONSOLATION FROM THE STARS

SUFFRAGISTS who are depressed by President Wilson's firm refusal to espouse their cause and by the two-to-one vote of the House Democratic caucus against taking up the proposed suffrage amendment may possibly find some consolation in the stars.

At least, a gifted astrologer, Prof. William J. Maccabee, whose forecast has been given wide circulation, assures them that "the final, complete and universal victory for woman suffrage" will be won in 1918. Even the most impatient suffragist should be willing to wait four years for a result so glorious. Professor Maccabee sustains his prediction by a highly convincing horoscope in which, as he has adjusted it, the stars not only prophesy the final and complete victory just mentioned, but tell just what public offices woman is fitted for, and just what offices she will control exclusively after the necessary period of trial and disappointment is over. This horoscope meets a long-felt want; for there is nothing that a certain type of woman desires more than to know what offices she may hope to fill and what is the shortest way to getting them.

THE REMONSTRANCE regrets that it cannot conveniently reproduce Professor Maccabee's horoscope. The most that it can do is to give some faint idea how it works out; and being confessedly only an amateur in astrology, there is danger that it may do the thing injustice.

However, the horoscope is first divided into twelve "houses,"—the odd-numbered ones designated "masculine" and the even-numbered ones "feminine." Everything depends, so to speak, upon which star gets into which. Thus Mars is ordinarily considered masculine, but when he gets over in Scorpio, a feminine sign, he becomes feminine. This seems odd, but it may have some occult connection with the militancy of the English suffragettes.

House ten in the zodiacal map is "the significator of the government." Its nature (or sex) is "feminine": its lord "masculine." This, says Professor Maccabee, "indicates that the affairs of the government should be ruled over by man and woman equally, or individually." But Professor Maccabee goes a little too far in permitting a masculine "lord" in this feminine house; nothing could be more irregular, from the suffragist point of view. He may possibly be forgiven this slip, however, in view of the fact that he places always under the control of woman, house two, which indicates the financial affairs of government. This is a "feminine" house and its planet is Venus.

Professor Maccabee has a gloomy foreboding that his horoscope may not be instantly accepted. He admits that "the incredulous and skeptical" may doubt; but he is positive that "the heavenly bodies, ages ago, declared and signified, in their eternal revolutions, that man and woman must rule equally, and that woman is the equal of man in governing power." That being settled, what is the use of arguing the question further?

WHEN the Old Dominion liner *Monroe* was sunk off the Virginia coast on the 30th of January, by collision with the steamship *Nantucket*, there occurred one of those incidents, common enough at such times, but worth remembering. Ferdinand J. Kuehn, the wireless operator, stood on the deck as the vessel was filling rapidly with water. He wore a life belt and was about to step into a lifeboat. No passengers were in sight. But suddenly a woman rushed to his side. Kuehn at once took off his life belt, put it about the woman, helped her into the boat and went down with the sinking ship. The instinct which prompted this young fellow of twenty-one to give his life to save a woman from death is precisely the same chivalrous instinct which dictated the order "Ladies first" when the *Titanic* was sinking. Its survival among all classes of men is proof at once of the folly and wickedness of the sex war which the extreme suffragists are inclined to wage.

FORCIBLE FEEDING

FROM the amount of impassioned rhetoric upon the subject of forcible feeding of suffragette prisoners in England, it might be supposed that the practice was not only one of extreme cruelty, but one to which the English prison authorities were continually resorting.

It will be a surprise to most Americans at least to learn that from April to December 1913, there were only three cases of forcible feeding. This statement is made by Sir Thomas Barlow, on the authority of the Home Office. Yet the English suffragettes and their American allies will doubtless go right on making all the capital they can out of the alleged brutalities perpetrated in English prisons.

It would appear that the suffragists greatly exaggerate the severity of the practice as well as its frequency. An English physician, who has had many years' experience in the care of the insane, writes that it has been a part of his duty for years to feed by means of a tube patients who refuse food. He states that he has performed this operation innumerable times, including some of the most desperate and violent types of insanity, and he has never seen any untoward results following the practice. He mentions one case in particular of a patient who had cut his throat and was tube-fed every meal for five years,—about 5,000 forcible feedings in all. No harm came from it; but the patient would have speedily starved to death if he had not been thus fed.

The suffragists find this so-called "torture" too useful in playing upon the public sympathy to pay much attention to the facts. They published a four-page advertisement in the English Review for January, giving what purported to be details of personal experience of the practice and calling upon the public to make demonstrations against it.

One of the suffragettes, Miss Florence Ansell, after her release from Holloway jail, told heartrending tales at a suffrage meeting. In particular, she asserted that twice daily, while she was incarcerated, she had heard shrieks and moans proceeding from the cell of Miss Rachel Pease, another suffragette. A deputation of militants then waited upon the Bishop of London and urged him to visit the jail and make an investigation. Accompanied by another clergyman and with the consent of the Home Secretary, the Bishop visited the jail, and afterward, in a letter to the Women's Social and Political Union, he wrote:

"I found Miss Pease in the 'remand hospital' which is 300 yards from the 'convicted hospital' where Miss Ansel was lying. Miss Pease lay on a comfortable bed fully dressed and in a well-warmed cell. Her face was fully rounded, and she showed no signs of emaciation or distress."

The Bishop further wrote that Miss Pease told him that she had never shrieked, and had never been put into a padded cell, and that she said nothing to him about forcible feeding. The Bishop's letter enraged the suffragettes, and they expressed their resentment in characteristic fashion. On the next Sunday, February 1st, they repeatedly interrupted the consecration services which the Bishop was conducting at St. Michael's Church with chants about forcible feeding, and appeals to have a stop put to the torture of women in English prisons. They were removed, and, after the service, a force of police frustrated their attempt to reach the Bishop.

SUFFRAGE AND THE FEMINISTS

APPALLED by the storm of disapproval aroused by the extreme feminist utterances of W. L. George in the December Atlantic Monthly, some American suffragists have made haste to disavow Mr. George altogether as an exponent of suffrage ideas.

Miss Alice Stone Blackwell rather overdoes it. In an interview in the Boston Post of January 19, 1914, she is reported as saying: "As for this Mr. George that the professor (Professor Sedgwick) quotes as a spokesman of the English suffragettes, I never heard of him, and *the English women are disgusted at his utterances. They don't agree with him.*" This suggests the obvious query: If Miss Blackwell had never heard of Mr. George, how did she know that English women were disgusted at his utterances?

But the most amusing explanation of the W. L. George article offered by the suffragists is that the article was published through what might be described as the villainy of the anti-suffragists. Under this theory, it would appear that anti-suffragists persuaded Mr. George to write this article and persuaded the editor of The Atlantic to publish it, solely in order to discredit the suffrage movement. "The Listener" in the Boston Transcript of February 4, is the Sherlock Holmes who has unearthed this base plot of the anti-suffragists. He describes the W. L. George article as "a betrayer's dynamite, 'planted' expressly to be unearthed and exposed with virtuous indignation by the Antis."

There seems to be need of an extension of this theory. If the W. L. George article was "a betrayer's dynamite" planted with a view of bringing reproach upon the suffrage movement, then Miss Edna Kenton's article in the November Century, which admitted that the suffrage movement is "sex war" and declared that women had been set aside from life "no less in the Christian home than in the harem" must also have been "planted" with like malevolent intent. Also Mrs. Gallichan's article in The English Review, which made a plea for illicit relationship between men and women and declared that "if there were some open recognition of these partnerships outside of marriage, not necessarily permanent, there would be many women ready to undertake such unions gladly." Also, Mrs. Winifred Harper Cooley's ar-

ticle on "The Younger Suffragists" in Harper's Weekly for Sept. 27, 1913; and Inez Milholland's articles on "The Liberation of a Sex," "The Changing Home," etc., in McClure's Magazine in February, March and April, 1913; and Mrs. Havelock Ellis's declaration, in The Forum for April, 1913, that "any woman who is kept by a man, whether in marriage or not, is either a parasite or a prostitute," not to mention a good deal else of a similar sort, must have been similarly "planted."

One hardly knows which to marvel at most: the baseness of these anti-suffrage conspiracies, or their astonishing success.

SUFFRAGE "NON-PARTISANSHIP"

THINGS appear to be in rather a parlous state in the National Suffrage Association, so far as its pretensions to non-partisanship are concerned. It is to Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, who has as intimate knowledge of the affairs of the Association as any of the suffrage leaders, that we owe our information as to present conditions.

Writing in the Indianapolis News of January 31, 1914, Mrs. Harper states that "the national suffrage committee is in the entire control of the most active women workers in the Progressive Party... The official board at present is composed principally of Progressives and Socialists. All of its old members, who gave their time and service for years when there was no glory or profit or hope of early success, have been literally driven off."

The struggle for woman suffrage throughout the United States, Mrs. Harper writes, "is a long way from the end." The movement "has now reached a stage where it is more likely to be injured by the incompetence or indiscretion of its supporters than the opposition of its enemies." The greatest need of the suffrage movement at the present time, Mrs. Harper states, "is a new national association." She goes on to say that "The Congressional Union, just now in the limelight at Washington, is, however, as far from what is needed as could well be imagined. It is headed by two young women, whose only training was under Mrs. Pankhurst, and whose claim to distinction, prior to coming to Washington, rested on a term in an English prison." These energetic young women, however, proceeded, while still in the Washington headquarters of the national committee, "to organize a rival national association for the express purpose of securing an amendment to the Federal Constitution, soliciting funds from all over the country. The old national board were about eight months getting their eyes open to the true situation, and then they appointed another national committee, with Mrs. McCormick at the head." The two radical young women "are now going forward with the nationalizing of their organization, patterning it closely after Mrs. Pankhurst's Political Union. They call it the Congressional Union, and it has no constitution or officers. They have constituted themselves and three or four others equally radical a self-perpetuating committee, with complete authority and declared their policy, a la Pankhurst, to 'fight the party in power,' regardless of the status of individual members, unless it takes favorable action on woman suffrage. They already announce contributions of $40,000."

These frank disclosures of suffrage dissensions, by a suffrage leader so well informed as Mrs. Harper, are instructive. It will be interesting to see what success, if any, attends the movement which she advocates for displacing both the partisan National Association and the militant Pankhurst-trained Congressional Union with a new national association organized along the earlier lines.

THE ANNUAL LUNCHEON

IN spite of record-breaking cold, nearly 1,000 anti-suffragists filled the large and small ball rooms of the Hotel Somerset, Boston, on the afternoon of January 13, for the annual luncheon of the Massachusetts Association. On the platform with Mrs. James M. Codman, the president, were Mrs. Rowland Hazard and Mrs. A. T. Dudley, presidents of the Rhode Island and New Hampshire Associations, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, president of the National Association, and Mrs. H. D. Warren of Toronto, who represented the Canadian Association.

After a brief opening address, Mrs. Codman introduced Mr. Edward S. Martin, literary editor of Life and author of "The Unrest of Woman." Mr. Martin remarked that the main question was whether it would pay women to vote and whether it would pay to have them vote; whether, having already half of the adult population directly concerned in politics, it is necessary now to put the other half on the same job. He said that not enough of the right sort of women wanted to vote; and he declared that men will never be obliged to women for being what men can be or doing what men can do, but it is in the power of women to make men grateful and submissive by being what men are not and doing what they cannot do.

Mrs. Josephine Daskam Bacon, the well-known magazine writer, was the next speaker. She spoke as an anti-suffragist outside of the organization; reviewed anti-suffragist and suffragist arguments; declared the real point to be whether the system of government of this country was likely to be improved by adding women's confusion to that of men; and closed by saying that, as a wage-earner, an employer, a self-supporter, a wife, a mother and a housekeeper, she could not see one circumstance or situation in her life where the possibility of the ballot could assist her or any of those dependent on her in any capacity.

Mrs. Dodge spoke of the growth of the National Association, and of the extension of its work in the South and West; and Mrs. Warren gave a brief greeting from the Canadian Association.

WOMEN'S SCHOOL VOTE AT A STANDSTILL

DURING the twenty years 1891 to 1910, the women's school vote in Massachusetts averaged 15,706. In 1911 it rose to 22,755; in 1912 to 46,716; and in 1913 to 39,564:—increases of 7,049, 31,010, and 23,858 respectively. But in 1911 in Fall River and Lowell alone the women's vote suddenly increased 7,074, 99 per cent of the state wide increase for that year; in 1912, in Fall River, Lowell, Brockton and Cambridge the women's vote suddenly increased 26,972, 87 per cent of the state wide increase for 1912; and in 1913 the state wide decrease of 7,152, from the vote of 1912, is matched by a decrease in the above-named four cities of about 10,000 votes. The outbursts of interest in these four cities were due to special, local issues which are now passed and the subsidence of the women's vote to the normal has already begun by a 25 per cent decrease in 1913. Aside from the fluctuations in the votes of these four cities, the school vote in the state, since 1910, has shown a normal increase of about 7300 votes, or six-tenths of one per cent of the 1,130,000 adult women of the state, an annual increase of but two-tenths of one per cent.

In all the 321 towns, since 1910, the aggregate women's vote has increased by only 4,176, an annual increase of three-tenths of one per cent compared with the 367,000 women of voting age in the towns in 1913. At this rate of increase 150 years would be required before a majority of women in the towns voted.

In Boston from 1895 to 1914, the number of women of voting age has increased from 167,000 to about 225,000, more than 30 per cent, while the actual vote with some fluctuations has decreased from 9,049 in 1895 to 3,086 in 1914, 66 per cent in the same period.

Except, therefore, for the increased vote due to the special, local contests in four cities, the normal increase has been so small as to be negligible; and any claim that the actual increase in the women's vote in Massachusetts from 1910 to 1913 shows a growing, permanent interest in woman suffrage as such is not supported by the facts of the case.

ARGUMENTS OR A CLUB?

THE Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage, which represents the more radical element of the suffragists, has definitely decided upon the policy of clubbing the Democratic party into submission.

The Democratic President having twice courteously but firmly refused to declare himself upon a policy regarding which his party has made no expression, and the House Democratic caucus having voted, 123 to 57, that "the question of suffrage is a State and not a Federal question," the Congressional Union has determined that the Democratic party, as a party, must be held responsible, and its candidates, no matter what their personal views on suffrage may be, must be beaten at the polls. This seems rather an ambitious programme for an organization which, up to last January, had only 1,000 members, who had paid 25 cents each as a membership fee.

But Miss Alice Paul, the head of the Union, is extremely firm. She says: "President Wilson was elected by a majority numerically smaller than the strength of the suffrage states, and we propose to show that the women voters of those states can wipe out that majority." Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, speaking also for the Union, declares that "the Democratic Senators from suffrage states must go" which seems rather a cruel doom, since it was they who packed the Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage and secured a favorable report on the proposed amendment. And Mrs. Glendower Evans, in The Suffragist for February 7, speaking of President Wilson's rebuff to the last suffrage delegation which waited on him, says: "Both he and his party must be held responsible, together and singly, leader and rank and file." It was Mrs. Evans, by the way, who headed that delegation and told the President delicately that his attitude was different before the Presidential election "when he was gunning for votes."

The National American Woman Suffrage Association disavows responsibility for the Congressional Union; and Mrs. McCormick, chairman of the Congressional Committee of that Association, wrote to President Wilson, January 28: "In view of the fact that the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage has publicly announced a policy contemplating an attack upon the Democratic party as a whole, and fearing lest this small group of suffragists, acting under un-American and militant methods, prejudice our cause, will you permit us to make clear that our organization, the National American Woman Suffrage Association, being strictly non-partisan, emphatically condemns this policy?"

"Un-American and militant." These are strong words which Mrs. McCormick uses to describe the methods of the more radical faction of the suffrage organizations. Yet it is a question of degree rather than of principle. The Congressional Union proposes to smash a party because it cannot force it to concede its demands. The Woman Suffrage Association proposes to smash the political prospects of individual members of Congress for the same reason. And it was Mrs. McCormick herself who last October led the suffrage campaign against Judge Puterbaugh of the Illinois Supreme Court, for no better reason than the fear that he might not lean toward the suffrage side in interpreting a constitutional question. For that proceeding Mrs. McCormick was rebuked by Mrs. McCulloch, in words quite as severe as those which Mrs. McCormick now applies to the Congressional Union.

Anti-suffragists may view with composure these varying manifestations of suffrage unreason and militancy. They serve to make clear the real animus of the suffrage movement and to promote the concentration against it of men of all parties.

GETTING THEIR MONEY'S WORTH

American suffragists, who contributed $20,000, more or less, to help Mrs. Pankhurst in her militant campaign, should be interested to know how the money is being spent.

January 24, militant suffragettes destroyed with a bomb the conservatory of the Glasgow Botanic Gardens; February 4, they burned Aberruchill Castle, near Comrie, Perthshire, Scotland, the "House of Rose" in the same neighborhood, and Saint Fillan's, a fine mansion, owned by the husband of a vice-president of the Edinburgh anti-suffrage league; February 7, they burned to the ground Hazlebank House, a fine mansion near Inverness, Scotland; February 12, they burned the Carnegie Library at Northfield, Worcestershire, and placed a bomb on a window sill of the residence of Arthur Chamberlain, near Birmingham; February 18, a militant suffragette, armed with a whip, savagely attacked Baron Weardale, an elderly peer, and one of the joint-presidents of the National League for Opposing Woman Suffrage, and, striking him from behind, as he was waiting for his train at a London railway station, felled him to the ground; February 26, an arson squad of suffragettes burned to the ground the historic church of Whitekirk, near Dunbar, Scotland,—a church which was erected in the thirteenth century, and contained many priceless relics; March 1, they exploded a bomb in the Church of St. John the Evangelist, Westminster, half an hour after the congregation had left after the evening service; March 10, May Richardson, a notorious militant, cut and hacked with a hatchet the famous Velasquez picture, the "Rokeby Venus" in the National Gallery, which was purchased in 1906 at a cost of $225,000 and given to the nation,—in consequence of which outrage most of the national galleries and palaces devoted to art collections have been closed to visitors; March 11, a suffragette arson squad destroyed all the buildings belonging to the town corporation at Bulcote, near Nottingham; March 12, militants burned a large unoccupied mansion belonging to the Free Church of Scotland at Stewarton, Ayrshire; March 15, suffragists permanently marred the famous Burne-Jones window in Birmingham Cathedral by painting "Votes for Women" across it; March 16, a militant attempted to horsewhip Dr. James Devon, royal prison commissioner, at Glasgow, but, after striking several blows, was knocked down by him; March 17, suffragettes threw suffrage pamphlets at the King and Queen at a music hall performance in London in aid of a hospital, and tried to address them, but were escorted out of the theatre by the police; on the same day, a militant, dressed in man's clothing, and carrying a dog whip secreted in her sleeve, was arrested in the lobby of the House of Commons, and admitted that she was waiting for a chance to "give Premier Asquith or Home Secretary McKenna a good thrashing."

This list is not exhaustive, but it shows that the American suffragists who contributed to Mrs. Pankhurst's cause are getting an ample money's worth.

STILL "IN THE CESSPOOL"

So long ago as the 25th of last October, The Boston Traveler, under the title, "In the Cesspool" said editorially:

In the name of equal suffrage, the Pankhurstites in New York City attempted to sell copies of a publication that had been suppressed in London and that, appropriately enough, was published thereafter in Paris.

In the name of equal suffrage young girls were detailed to sell that publication and girls and boys were among those who were permitted to buy and read freely until the New York police commissioner intervened and asked for warrants.

In the name of equal suffrage, conditions have become such, as far as literature is concerned, that strict censorship must be established in every well-regulated home.

Isn't it about time to take the suffrage cause out of the cesspool and place it where it belongs?

This was a sensible appeal. But the influences which The Traveler deplored are even more rampant than they were six months ago, and the suffrage cause remains where The Traveler placed it.

THE FEDERAL AMENDMENT KILLED

The United States Senate, March 19, killed the joint resolution, providing for the submission to the States of an equal suffrage amendment to the Federal Constitution. The vote was 35 in favor to 34 opposed, 27 of the Senators not voting. In a full Senate, 64 votes—or two-thirds of 96—were required to pass the resolution. The proposition, therefore, fell 29 votes short of the number necessary. The division was not along party lines. Fourteen Democrats and 21 Republicans voted for the resolution, and 22 Democrats and 12 Republicans voted against it.

NEW YORK suffragists insisted that the Legislature should pass a bill providing for women watchers at the polls when the vote is taken next year, upon the proposed suffrage amendment. But when the Senate Judiciary Committe reported the bill with a proviso that there should be two women watchers at each polling place, one a suffragist and the other an anti-suffragist, the suffragists strenuously protested. But if what they really wanted was fair play, what could be fairer than that both parties concerned should be represented at the polls?

FOUR KINDS OF WOMEN

(Miss Gertrude E. Knox, in the Trenton Gazette, Jan. 12, 1914—"with apologies to Confucius.")

She who wishes the vote, and knows why she wishes it is a feminist. Oppose her.

She who wishes the vote and does not know why she wishes it is a suffragist. Pity her.

She who does not wish the vote and does not know why she does not wish it is asleep. Awake her.

She who does not wish the vote and knows why she does not wish it is an Anti. Follow her.

A DISAPPOINTED MILITANT

That must have been a disappointed militant who undertook to horsewhip Dr. James Devon, royal prison commissioner, at Glasgow, on the 16th of March.

In advance, the thing seemed simple enough. A few weeks before, Premier Asquith had been horsewhipped on the golf links and had borne it politely. A little later, an elderly peer, waiting for his train at a London railway station, had been felled to the ground by a furious suffragette who attacked him from behind with a horsewhip. But, beyond a moderate fine, nothing came of it. What could be easier than to horsewhip Dr. Devon? The militant was sure to get her name into the papers and perhaps her picture too; and she could feel that she had greatly helped the cause of "Votes for women."

But upon one point she miscalculated. Dr. Devon was not so polite as Mr. Asquith, nor so feeble as the elderly peer. After several cuts with the whip, he apparently thought that the thing had gone far enough, and with a single blow of his unchivalrous fist, he knocked the woman down,—actually knocked her down, and she was borne off by the police, shrieking protests against his brutality.

The next thing should be an organized demonstration by the suffragettes against public officials who will not stand still and take it quietly whenever it occurs to a militant that it is time for them to be horsewhipped.

THE "HOMES TO BE"

In a lecture at the Hotel Astor, New York City, March 10, Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman presented her ideal of "the home to be." She said that "the home now is a check upon the growth of humanity" and "the home we have always had, and it has done us no good." But the home of the future, she went on to say, "is one in which not one stroke of work shall be done except by professional people who are paid by the hour;" and "A woman's relation to the home will eventually be exactly what the man's is." "The home doesn't fall to the ground when the man goes out to work," said Mrs. Gilman, "why should it when the woman goes out?"

This is too much for The New York Evening Post, suffragist advocate though it is, and it says of it:

"If every home in the United States were to depend upon professional domestic labor, we should need, at a moderate estimate, say, ten million women servants, allowing one servant for the work of two families. Where are these ten million women laborers to come from? Obviously, they can come only from the ranks of the women who have been liberated from the burden of toiling for their husbands and their children. It does not matter whether the cooking or the laundry work of the future will be done in individual homes—Mrs. Gilman says she wants the home preserved—or in great central institutions. Apparently, therefore, the future of women depends on adopting the institutions of China, where they make a living by taking in each other's wash. Women are to be emancipated in order that they may do each other's cooking. Mrs. Smith will kiss her children good-by and go out to cook Mrs. Brown's dinner. And Mrs. Brown will kiss her children good-by and go out to cook Mrs. Smith's dinner. Being obliged to keep professional hours, however, the chances are that they will have no time to kiss the children good-by."

AMERICAN MILITANCY

"If the Constitution stands in our way, let's tear it up, and make a new one."—Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, at the convention of the National Woman Suffrage Association at Washington, December, 1913.

"I meant what I said before leaving the United States. If New York fails to awake, *we shall introduce militant methods of the type used by the Women's Social and Political Union.*"—Mrs. Oliver H. P. Belmont, in an interview with the London correspondent of the Associated Press, April 28, 1913.

"If we are played with, made fun of, just tolerated, greeted with supercilious smiles by members of Congressional committees, *there is nothing for us to do but to resort to militant methods.* We hope we will not be driven to measures as severe as those used in England, but, if it does come, the daughters of old English sires will be ready to suffer here as women are suffering in England."—Dr. Anna Shaw in The New York Times, March 17, 1912.

POOR SENATOR ASHURST

Poor Senator Ashurst, of Arizona, after leading the fight in the Senate for the suffrage amendment for weeks, under the assumption that the suffragists really wanted a vote on it as soon as possible, received a peremptory and vehement telegram from Mrs. Belmont, saying: "If you allow the woman-suffrage amendment to go to a vote now, I shall consider you false to our interests and shall not hesitate to make the fact known in important places." Mr. Ashurst laid his griefs before the Senate on the 16th of March, and read the telegrams which he had received from suffragists all over the country, some asking him to push for an immediate vote, others urging him to wait until after the suffrage parade, and others urging delay until nearly the end of the session. The Senate thought it best to go on, though it felt for Mr. Ashurst's predicament; and three days later, it killed the amendment.

SOCIALISM AND SUFFRAGE

(Miss Annie Bock, of Los Angeles, former Secretary of Woman Suffrage Campaign Committee, before House Committee on Rules, Dec. 4, 1913.)

Had you become intimately acquainted with socialism and woman suffrage not only by reading but by listening to talks and lectures for three years, or say, for even three months, I say, had you attended suffragist and socialist lectures in parlor, school house, woman's club, church, theatre, hall, labor temple, hobo mission, I. W. W. hangout, and on the street corner, you would pronounce woman suffrage the Daughter of Socialism, at least you would acknowledge them Twin Sisters, for you would have found them ever walking hand in hand. Both work on the sympathies of a kind, well-meaning, thoughtless, unsuspecting and ignorant public.

"WOMEN OPPOSED TO 'DRY' CHICAGO"

Under the above heading the Chicago Examiner of February 11 published a statement by Agne Felice, member of the Executive Committee of the United Societies for Local Self-Government, in the course of which she said:

There will be as many liberally-minded as conservatively-minded women going to the polls. I count as the conservatively-minded women those whose cry is "Prohibition." They are those who believe the "Golden Era" will have arrived when neither husband nor wife will be able to obtain a glass of beer to drink, and when the saloons shall be closed. That hundreds of thousands of human beings will at that time be deprived of their existence, and that our city administration will be nearing bankruptcy when that time arrives, seems to arouse no scruples on the part of these fanatics.

Miss Felice asserts that the Women's Liberty League, the organization which she represents, has more followers than any other woman's organization in Chicago.

This seems to confirm the statement made by A. J. Cormak, secretary of the United Societies last July, that "now that suffrage is a reality, we shall organize our women, and expect to have no difficulty in getting results at the polls." Mr. Cormak spoke for the united saloon interests, and the Women's Liberty League was organized expressly to "get results" for them.

THAT SEATTLE ELECTION

The suffragists are having a hard time trying to explain how it came to pass that "Hi" Gill, whose recall as Mayor of Seattle in 1911 was hailed as a great moral victory, and attributed to women's votes, was again elected Mayor on the third of March by a majority of about 14,000.

The Woman's Journal's explanation is that "the more desirable nominees all failed to get their names upon the official ballot," that both of the candidates nominated were "unacceptable" to good citizens, but that they voted for Gill because the other man was worse. But that is not an explanation that really explains. How did it happen that both of the candidates who emerged from the primaries were "undesirables"? If the women who gloried in the recall of Gill had concentrated their efforts upon the nomination of a good man, could they not have got his name upon the ballot? If they could not, their influence for municipal uplift has been greatly exaggerated. And if they could, but did not, what shall be said of them?

THE THINGS BEYOND

Every now and then we have hints and intimations,—and this from suffrage sources—of some of the things that lie beyond the demand for "Votes for Women."

Here is an interview with Judge Lindsey in the Cincinnati Commercial-Tribune of January 17, in which some light is thrown on the things beyond,—and behind—the cry of "votes for women":

"Equal suffrage has many admirable features, but the trouble is that women will not stop there. Other questions of sex are vexatious, and with which I heartily disagree. The one great argument of the feminist is that it will make better men. As I see it, it will make looser women. Here comes a feminist, who advocates woman choosing the father of her child. What piffle! In a single stroke she would break down the barriers that have protected the legitimacy of our children for centuries. . . . If the ideas that these faddists continue to create grow and spread, the only thing I can see ahead is loose morals, and loose marriage laws. It is time to call a halt."

In view of such a bill as that now pending in the New York legislature, which provides a fine of from $10 to $50 for each qualified elector who fails to register and vote at a State election, what becomes of the argument that, under suffrage, a woman who does not want to vote need not, and that it is wrong to stand in the way of even a small minority of women who want to vote?

THE NEW PAGANISM

In a recent sermon, quoted in The Literary Digest of January 31, Cardinal O'Connell of Boston made the following earnest protest against the "new paganism" exemplified in recent tendencies;

We need be neither prude nor Puritan to see and to realize that something is passing in the heart and mind of the women today which is leaving them hard and unwomanly, and that year by year this transformation goes on until, if it continues, there will be neither home nor family, nor normal womanly nature left.

If this is the new woman, then God spare us from any further development of an abnormal creature. Certainly this is not the Catholic woman who is true to her faith and is not easily influenced by these modern fads of a new paganism. She has her standards and she stands by them unchanged."

The South Carolina House of Representatives, January 25, rejected unanimously a proposed suffrage amendment; the Mississippi House, January 22, defeated a similar proposal by a vote of 80 to 42; the Maryland House of Delegates, February 18, killed the proposed amendment by a vote of 60 to 34; and the Virginia House of Delegates, March 11, rejected the amendment by a vote of only 13 yeas to 74 nays. The Kentucky House took similar action by a vote of 29 yeas to 51 nays. Here are five suffrage defeats in state legislatures already this year.

Mr. George Creel, who wrote with such enthusiasm of what women have done with the vote, in The Century Magazine for March, was one of the chief speakers at a feminist mass meeting in New York city, February 17. As reported in the New York Press, he said that chivalry is "bunk" and "the good old home is 'bunk.'"

In New Jersey, as in New York and Massachusetts, a Men's League has been formed to oppose woman suffrage. Prof. William Libbey of the faculty of Princeton University, has accepted the chairmanship of the League.

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

THE CHIEF VALUE of the suffrage hearing before the House Judiciary Committee at Washington, March 3, was the exhibition of hopeless and bitter suffrage dissensions. The extract from the Rockland Courier-Gazette, printed in another column, describes these accurately.

THAT rather notorious politician, Alderman Coughlin of Chicago, widely known as "Bath House John," had the enthusiastic support of the Woman's Democratic Club of his ward, which commended him unanimously as "a good family man, who has always used his best endeavors to serve the people."

THE MORE sensible suffragists are beginning to see that suffrage "hikes," while they serve to bring a certain type of women into the limelight, do harm to the suffrage cause. This is why the Maryland State Suffrage Committee has voted that there must be no more "hikes" in that state.

MEAGRE as the women's vote was in Boston in 1913, it dropped to a still lower level at the election last January. In one ward, only 19 women voted, in another 20, in another 23, in another 27; and in the whole city only 3,086. When less than one and a half per cent of the women of voting age use the voting privilege which they have, they do not show a consuming desire for an extension of the suffrage.

ONE of the peculiar performances of that California legislature of 1913, of which the suffragists have made so much, as the first legislature elected in part by women's votes, was an arrangement for a recess during which pending bills might be submitted to the consideration of "the people." Each member was permitted to send full sets to as many as ten constituents. But as there were no less than 3,738 bills and 149 proposed constitutional amendments pending, this arrangement presupposed more industry on the part of the constituents than most of them would have been likely to possess.

IT WAS Miss Mae E. Mathews who, at the hearing at the State House on the 16th of February, told the Committee that she was so determined to vote for school committee at the last election in Boston that she "went back in all the cold and voted again." That is "repeating" and men have often been sent to jail for it; but Miss Mathews seemed to regard it either as a good joke or a praiseworthy display of zeal.

REFERRING to the complete exoneration of Senator Gore of Oklahoma from certain charges brought against him by an Oklahoma woman for blackmailing purposes, The Living Church of Milwaukee justly says:

It cannot be doubted that the advent of woman into politics carries with it, as a by-product, this new peril to the legislator, who must deal with her as a voter and a politician while she may still deal with him as a female.

IN PORTLAND, Oregon, last December, there was a special municipal election, at which the voters were called upon to vote on fifteen charter amendments submitted under the commission government. The amendments were various in character, and one of them which provided for a "morals court" at which judges might hear privately cases involving moral delinquency was of a kind which might have been expected to appeal especially to the newly enfranchised women. Including the women, over 140,000 were entitled to register and vote. Yet not one of the measures called out a vote of 15,000; and the "morals court" amendment was defeated by a vote of more than two to one.

THAT political uplift, which is promised in connection with woman suffrage, manifested itself early in the Chicago primaries. The Board of Election Commissioners issued instructions to the effect that women must give their exact ages when registering. But, in an address to members of the Woman's Party of Cook County, February 8, Charles H. Mitchell, attorney for the Board of Election Commissioners, said: "You can approximate the truth, and it will do no one any harm. Select a good probable age—one that fits your face and your figure—and tell the officials that age." Another indication of the new order of things was the distribution of more than a thousand boxes of confectionery among the women who attended, February 9, a political meeting addressed by Thomas H. Donoghue, candidate for alderman in the 28th ward.

THE SUFFRAGISTS are in the habit of reckoning the state granges as on their side. So far as the claim has any basis, it rests on resolutions passed by state conventions, often with little consideration and from a mistaken sense of courtesy. But last year, the Massachusetts Grange, wishing to test the real sentiment of its members on the suffrage question, submitted it to a referendum vote of the membership, and the returns showed a large majority in opposition. According to Mrs. Nahum J. Batchelder, a leader in the New Hampshire Grange, not more than 20 per cent of the 30,000 Patrons of Husbandry in that state favor suffrage; yet the state convention passed suffrage resolutions.

THE SUFFRAGIST DISSENSIONS

(From the Rockland, Me., Courier-Gazette, Mar. 10, 1914.)

The suffragist dissensions, created by the extreme policy of the Congressional Union, made themselves rather painfully apparent at the hearing before the House Judiciary Committee at Washington. When the leaders of the National Woman Suffrage Association urged that, if the women could not get an equal suffrage amendment, they would like an amendment to allow the question to be decided by a referendum in the various states instead of by the legislatures, the leaders of the Congressional Union jumped up and told the Committee that the women wanted nothing of the kind, and when the Congressional Union speakers threatened Congress and the Democratic party with vengeance if their demands were not conceded, the representatives of the National Woman Suffrage Association disclaimed all responsibility for the threat. Altogether, the hearing left rather a confused impression of the suffragists' wishes and intentions.

THE FEMINIST MOVEMENT

To the Editor of the Remonstrance:

The feminist movement at the point which it has now reached is probably the most colossal piece of conceit and egotism that has ever dared to proclaim itself in public. To hear women assert that they are the finest things on earth is ludicrous and pathetic at the same time. In the beginning when they were asking for educational privileges in order to prove themselves the equals of their brothers, it was possible to sympathize with them to a certain extent, but although they have now had for a good many years the same educational facilities as men they fail to give us any decided proofs of their superiority.

Most of us still employ a man for a serious surgical operation, or to take care of our property, or to give us expert legal advice, while in the artistic field the best architects, painters, musicians and writers still seem to be men. Women, in these days of higher education, do not produce any better works than Mme. Vigee Le Brun, the Brontës, Fanny Burney, George Eliot, Maria Edgeworth, Jane Austen or Elizabeth Barrett Browning, who poor things! were all down trodden, un-emancipated victims of man's tyranny. In the light of these facts the calmer, less hysterical women require more proof to convince them that they are the superior beings that their feminist sisters believe themselves to be. More than mere assertion is necessary to prove the discovery of a new genus, even though it is loudly and widely proclaimed.

The human child upon whom the continuance of the race depends is the one thing which woman can nurture and cultivate better than man. It is this paramount creation which some of the feminists have the impudence to call a waste of time! The president of a Woman's College, for example, thinks she has accomplished something so superior to a fine human child that she advises her pupils against marriage as likely to spoil or interfere with their success in life! and advises them instead to follow in her footsteps! Words fail me before such blind self-satisfaction as this! and there are many others like her who consider a "career" and "the development of their individuality" of far more importance than the progress of the human race.

The woman movement has done and still is doing good. The banding together of women for the public good in non-sectarian, non-partisan bodies like the woman's clubs and the municipal leagues is a very fine and useful thing, but just as you prune a plant that is putting all its strength into one of its many branches to the detriment of the others so the woman movement is in dire need of pruning. It should be the business of all sensible women not blinded by egotism and self-importance to see that the plant is well cut back so that it may have time and energy to produce a few blossoms, and to see that it does not run itself out in the overgrown but barren branches of suffrage and feminism which for the health and development of the whole ought to be quickly and relentlessly removed.

Caroline M. Parker.

THE ELECTION at Santa Monica, California, last December, did not sustain the suffragist claim that the votes of women may be counted on to promote moral uplift. The chief issue was an ordinance to close the saloons on Sunday and to put a stop to sales of liquor in cafes after a certain hour in the evening. The proposed ordinance was defeated by a vote of nearly three to one. About 2,400 votes were cast by women, an overwhelming majority of them in favor of "wet" Sundays and open saloons.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR WOMEN VOTERS

Mr. Charles H. Mitchell, Attorney of the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners, has undertaken to answer the questions of new women voters. Here are some questions and answers from the Chicago Examiner of February 11:

Question: How can I familiarize myself with matters of city government? I don't seem to get much out of books.

Answer: The practical end is probably best for you. Attend meetings of city council and listen attentively to the proceedings. You can also learn thereby the fidelity or lack of fidelity of the individual aldermen.

Question: Does an alderman have the right to distribute city jobs?

Answer: Each of the thirty-five wards in Chicago is a separate barony. Each of the two aldermen in each ward has the right—an unwritten law—to distribute one-half of the patronage of the ward.

Question: Does an alderman have the right to get a man out of jail?

Answer: Have a heart, dear lady. Strange things and weird are sometimes accomplished by aldermen. A little influence here, a little pressure there, and the results are surprising. There are some things you must learn by experience.

Evidently: but does it promise to be an elevating experience?

MISS ALYSE GREGORY, one of the state organizers of the Connecticut Woman Suffrage Association, is reported by the Waterbury American of January 13 as saying, in a lecture at the headquarters of the Equal Franchise League, "that all women should be self-supporting, though married, and that the state should recompense women for the service they do in bearing it citizens." This suggests the rapid spread of radical ideas of the things that "lie beyond suffrage."

MASSACHUSETTS ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS will not soon forget the force and earnestness with which their cause was presented, in this year's debates in the Legislature, by Senator O'Rourke of Worcester, Senator Wells of Haverhill, and by Representatives Sherburne of Brookline, Abbott of Haverhill, Hurlburt of Worcester, Kennard of Somerville, Collins of Amesbury, and White of Newton.

AT the three inter-collegiate debates which took place March 27, between Harvard and Princeton teams at Cambridge, Yale and Harvard teams at New Haven, and Princeton and Yale teams at Princeton, on the question "Resolved, That the women of the United States should be given suffrage on equal terms with the men," it is significant that the judges, in every case, decided for the team which took the negative side.

"WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN PRACTICE" is a pamphlet which has been prepared and published by the Massachusetts Association, in criticism of and reply to Mr. George Creel's article in The Century Magazine for March on "What Have Women Done with the Vote?" It will be found readable and illuminating. Single copies will be mailed to any address for five cents, or ten copies for twenty-five cents.

THE MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE REJECTS THE PROPOSED REFERENDUM TO MEN AND WOMEN AND APPROVES A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

HEARING ON THE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

At the hearing at the State House, on the morning and evening of February 16, before the legislative Committee on Constitutional Amendments, upon petitions asking for an amendment to the Constitution striking the word "male" from the qualifications of voters, the case for the suffragists was conducted by Mrs. Teresa A. Crowley, representing the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association. Mr. Henry Sterling represented the state branch of the American Federation of Labor; Mr. Fred B. Chase and Miss Ellen Hayes, the Socialist party; Mrs. Helen Parker, the Mass. Political Equality Union; Mr. Joseph Walker, the Progressive party; and Mrs. Katharine L. Stevenson, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Ex-Senator George L. Barnes of Weymouth, and ex-Representative Truman R. Hawley of Malden conducted the case for the opposition, in behalf of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

Anti-Suffrage Sentiment Gaining

Mrs. Henry Preston White stated that the Association opposed to woman suffrage has now over 22,000 Massachusetts women in its membership, an increase of 4,000 during the past year. It has members in 384 cities, towns and villages, and embraces many wage-earners, as well as other women who are opposed to a thing that is harmful not only to the women themselves, but to the State as a whole. The New Jersey Anti-Suffrage Association has 10,000 members, of whom 9,000 are wage-earners. The Wage-Earners' Anti-Suffrage League of New York has 3,000 members. In Michigan and Ohio the Anti-Suffrage Associations turned the tide.

Letter from ex-Governor Guild

Miss Mary S. Ames read a letter from ex-Governor Curtis Guild, who wrote that our great failures in legislation today are caused not so much by any vicious element among our voters as by abstention from voting and by emotional voting. Directing attention to the results of careless and hysterical voting, he said:

"If ever calmness and common sense were needed they are today. Conditions call for the brake, not for the accelerator.

"It is my profound conviction that the imposition upon the controller of the family's private relations of duties which naturally fall upon the one who now controls the family's public relations, far from bettering any present good would more than double existing evil. The fanatic vote, the hysterical and emotional vote, the vote of the immoral and degenerate would be doubled without one single compensating benefit, for the stay-at-home vote would be more than doubled. . . .

"It is illogical and absurd that in determining the future of the entire female sex, men alone should be consulted as demanded by the suffragists. There should be brought out by popular vote, extended to women as well as men, an honest expression of opinion—by men as to whether they believe the proposed extension of the suffrage will be advantageous—by women as to whether they are willing to assume this burden and responsibility. Such a vote, participated in by both men and women, would be illuminating in its results and would at least furnish what we have not now: a basis for intelligent action based on facts, as distinguished from sentimental action based on supposition."

Can Serve the State without the Ballot

Miss Lucy J. Price, of Ohio, in a very effective address, argued that women can best serve the State without the ballot. "Women united," she said, "can do wonders, but divided, as suffrage would divide us, woman's opportunities and achievements would be cut in halves. If the majority of women in Massachusetts wanted the ballot, they would soon get it. Public opinion makes the laws, and public opinion is made in the home. If the women get the vote, they will lessen their home influence, and thus a general influence for good.

Women Wage Earners Do Not Want the Ballot

At both the sessions, wage-earning women appeared to protest against the proposed amendment. Miss Mabel Greely Smith, a social worker, declared that women do not want to be used for political purposes. Mrs. Annie T. Chesley of Cambridge, another social worker, said that this is a period of unrest. There are many evils, and many remedies are proposed. But woman suffrage would be a disastrous remedy. Miss Mary Maguire, chief operator of the Milton telephone exchange, declared that the average business woman does not want suffrage. Of the forty girls in her exchange, thirty-eight are opposed to suffrage; of twenty school-teachers interviewed, only two favor suffrage; and of eight women employed in a hairdressing parlor, six are opposed to suffrage. She said that Massachusetts laws for women are just. Miss Estelle Hutchins, for twenty-two years a stenographer and private secretary, said that her experience in the business district of Boston had proved to her that women are treated with respect and courtesy by business men, and she was of the opinion that most of the women who wanted the vote wanted it because it was something they hadn't got. If women went into politics and into competition with men, they would lose the courtesies and consideration which they now enjoy. Miss Grace H. Boothby, who is employed in the office of a large leather concern, said that women, after their regular work is done, have household duties, or they need recreation to preserve their health and good spirits; and they resent the attempt to force them to study public questions to prepare themselves for voting.

Miss Mary White, employed in a printing office in Cambridge, said that all the working girls she talked with were opposed to being made to vote.

Privileges and Burdens

Mrs. William W. Churchill of Milton declared that Massachusetts women have all the privileges they need, and they cannot profitably bear the burden of the ballot. They do not need it, and it would hinder them in their work. If we should go out to do men's work, who will do ours?

A Woman Lawyer's View

Miss Monica Foley, a member of the Massachusetts bar, held the close attention of every one in the room by her forcible presentation of arguments against suffrage. She said that, in her opinion, suffrage would only intensify evil conditions. She did not consider the average woman better fitted to vote than the average man. She continued:

"I am opposed to suffrage because

it is too closely allied to socialism, and has not yet repudiated that alliance. I fail to see any benefit that can accrue from it. One of the worst conditions in the voting of men is indifference, and if the vote is enlarged to include women, that evil will be greatly increased. I mean that women will be indifferent. If women's conditions need remedying, Boston women should not have sent $2,000—and the women of the United States $18,000 to England by Mrs. Pankhurst. American dollars should have been kept at home to do American work. The vote means nothing when it comes to wages, as witness the army of unemployed men. Labor unions know that organization, not the ballot, means higher pay.

The One Question

Mr. Barnes, in his concluding statement in behalf of the Association, declared that the one question for the consideration of the Committee was: "What will promote the best interests of Massachusetts?" He asked the Committee whether, in the course of the hearing, running throughout almost the entire day, the advocates of the amendment had pointed out a single resulting advantage to the State of Massachusetts from enlarging the electorate by adding to it the women of the State.

No Injustice Shown

Mr. Barnes also alluded to the fact that, during the whole hearing, no injustice to the women of the State had been pointed out to the Committee. Turning to the speakers who had been urging the amendment, Mr. Barnes asked them to mention a single law which they had tried to have enacted in the interest of women, which the Legislature had refused to enact, or a single measure which they now hoped to secure with the aid of women's vote. Mr. Barnes waited for a reply, but none came.

HEARING ON THE "CODMAN BILL"

There was a hearing before the Committee on Election Laws, February 24, on the "Codman bill,"—so-called because petitioned for by Mrs. James M. Codman, in behalf of the Massachusetts Association. The bill provided for the submission of the question of the expediency of woman suffrage to the male voters of the State, and to women qualified to vote for School Committee.

Not a "Straw Vote"

Mr. Barnes, speaking in behalf of the bill, said that the anti-suffragists recognize that there is a considerable demand for equal suffrage, and they believe that women should not have suffrage imposed on them without having a voice in the matter. This is not a "straw vote" proposition, for if the majority should vote for woman suffrage, the anti-suffragists would yield.

Equally Vital to Anti-Suffragists

Mrs. Frank Foxcroft, chairman of the Cambridge Branch of the Association, said that this question was as vital to anti-suffragists as to suffragists. Suffragists claim that children would get more protective legislation from women's votes; anti-suffragists believe that children's homes would suffer if women's energies were withdrawn from them so much as they must be if women are to become effective voters. Suffragists hope to improve the condition of working women; anti-suffragists believe that the condition of all women is made worse by every movement which tends to lessen the division of labor between men and women and to increase the competition between them.

A Question of Consistency

Mrs. A. H. Parker of Dover said it was quite plain that the suffragists believed that the majority of women did not want woman suffrage, else they would not always oppose every proposal to give woman a chance to vote upon it. Suffragists charge anti-suffragists with inconsistency because some of them vote at school elections, but it is not so inconsistent for anti-suffragists to vote for school committee as it is for suffragists to fail to vote. Anti-suffragists who vote at school elections do so because they feel it an obligation; and it is because they feel that the full vote would be a much heavier obligation that they oppose woman suffrage.

The Silent Country Women

Mrs. Edward B. Cole of Wenham called attention to the fact that during the suffrage agitation of the last few years, while individuals from various industries and professions have asked for the ballot with increasing clamor, and have been opposed vigorously by other representatives of the same industries and professions, no word has come from the country women either for or against suffrage. That the majority of these women are opposed to suffrage has been shown by house-to-house canvasses in various small towns, and by the large majority in the State grange against suffrage.

Not Politicians but Statesmen

Mrs. John Balch of Milton expressed the conviction that no man had a moral right to vote for suffrage who did not believe in it, and that it ought never to pass a Legislature until a majority of the Senate and two-thirds of the House were suffragists. She urged the Committee to plead with the members of the Legislature that, in acting upon this question they be, not politicians, but statesmen.

An Unwholesome Agitation

Mrs. William W. Churchill urged that the constant agitation for and against suffrage was unwholesome and undesirable. It would be well to have the question settled, and by women themselves. If women in industry need the ballot, as the suffragists say, they surely need this opportunity to say so. If woman's "point of view" is needed in politics, it surely is needed upon this question. If it is just that women should have the ballot upon any question, it surely is just that they should have it upon this.

Suffragists Oppose the Bill

The suffragists, who are always unwilling that women should vote on the most important question of all,—the question whether the burden and responsibility of the ballot shall be thrust upon them—vehemently opposed the bill. They were represented by Mrs. Teresa Crowley, Michael F. Culliney, Joseph Walker, Wiliam S. Kinney, and Thomas P. Riley.

ACTION ON THE MEASURES

The Committee on Election Laws reported adversely upon the Codman bill, and its report was accepted by both houses without a division.

The Committee on Constitutional Amendments reported favorably upon the proposed amendment, and the Senate, March 10, after debate, passed the resolve for the submission of the amendment by a vote of 35 to 3, including one pair.

The House, March 26, after debate, passed the resolve by a vote of 179 to 50, including pairs.

The amendment must be acted on by the legislature which assembles next January, and, if it should again receive a majority vote in the Senate and a two-thirds vote in the House, it will be submitted to the electors at the election in November, 1915.